Linguistic status problem of the words in indo-European linguistics

*Jordan Jay L.**

Abstract

Analyzing the methodological specifics of interpreting words Indo-European linguistics, we offer a number of points differ from the standard formulation of the problem of linguistic status of the word. The problem of speech is rightly considered the most studied in Indo-European linguistics. Individual members of her circle of questions developed on the material of Russian, English, French, Spanish and many other languages. Nevertheless, the overall picture is viewed from different angles and perspectives words, there is still not enough lighting. Controversial in a number of cases the general principles of the approach to the word, to be selected in this context, the language of facts, methods of their description, comparison.

Keywords: linguistic, perspectives words, language of facts, indo-European

The greatest concern is the lack of specific scientific analysis of Indo-European words in the language of the question (that is, in connection with the problem of linguistic status of the word). Recognizing their some domestic linguists, however, say the ability of words - speech units to function beyond the scope of language regularity locale. It is sometimes argued that offers syntax controls the seamntics of its constituent words - language units, diagnosing their different seamntic variants. Priority is still given only seamntic units are not identical in existing and functioning in form of speech.

---

*State University of New York, Ucla Academy, USA.jordan.jay@ucla.edu

Behind the apparent diversity of the concepts of the seamntic modification of words in the speech, however, we cannot see is not entirely legitimate, in our view, understanding them as units. It does not take into account the formal transformation of words in the speech stream. Contrary to common in Indo-European linguistics tradition take the word duality of his identity "material shell" apart in language and speech is not considered in scientific terms. The formal differences between the words - units of language and speech, in fact, prove to be very significant.

Language is the loss of their property or graphical non- reparability, or of both at the same time. Changes in the speech flow of words of language units to consider them identical words as units of speech do not allow.

Lack of Indo-European linguistics, the question of a word as a unit of language and speech is explained by the absence of its differentiated consideration sounding speech and writing.

It should be clarified that after we keep sounding term, but not speaking. The seamntic structure of sounding speech as a term, given its membership in the common language system seems to us etymologically more justified than oral speech, disclosing therefore more the essence of this concept. For comparison: sounding speech from the sound of the sounds heard in contrast to the written language by writing and speaking from the mouth, i.e. mouth, lips, rather artificial way connected with the value of the spoken, not written. The use of the expression speaking, however, it is quite possible, in our opinion, in value.

Word in some few cases, subjected to linguistic analysis only in articulate speech. Implementation of various units, however, is not achieved only using phonetic means, but also communication using letters.

The theoretical basis for raising the issue of the delimitation of the words in the above-mentioned forms of speech are objectively existing differences between them. 'Tangible' arranged in a linear sequence in speech sounding units and written differently. The discrepancy between the forms involved in the construction of the speech chain linguistic elements causes a different degree of implementation of their capacity, resulting from the combination detected between functional connections and relationships. Rules connection language units in speech sound acoustic obey the rules of combinatory of language units; formation of words ordered in writing action of image factors.

Phonetic changes are modified in sounding speech language units are not always reflected in the words of graphics. On the contrary, the composition of individual graphic words in the written language is not in all cases,

provides insight into the phonetic modifications involved in their education language units.

Indo-European linguistics walks around the nature of the words along with an understanding of the latter and as a unit of language and speech in undifferentiated consideration of the oral and written speech are compounded, moreover, by declaring the word at the same time the unit expression plane and the content plane.

The need to consider in relation language, however, is not completely identical to each other formal and functional aspects do not give any reason for their identification as part of the same concept of the word. Completely impossible to make it any Indo-European language, without exception, are not deprived in this respect the asymmetry of the expression plane and the content of the plan. Is constituted by an legion of various shapes, characterized by a complex and multi-layered structure of the form and content can not be compared with each other as the substance of the material (ie uniform) and ideal (i.e. content).

The most popular in Indo-European linguistics, however, use the notion of the word as of a certain well-defined with no ontological status of the object that has such distinctive features as:

1. material, making it available for "sensory" perception; 2. Some thought content or meaning.

This sometimes language, sometimes speech character object appears as a haze shrouded in a known mist inseparable unity form and content. Under the concept of form in this case falls mostly only acoustic (phonetic) appearance of words, leaving open the question of whether it is possible and whether it is necessary to refer to his "material" expression graphic form.

Turning sound less graphic form, i.e. the actual meaning of the word (as a sign language or speech) is in conflict with the general understanding of how the sign of the functional element material system semiotic character. Signs in the terminological sense, referred to as "items that represent other things, not because of its natural properties, and by virtue of what they are, these objects are endowed with the property denoted other items." [Sun 1978, c.100]. The deterministic nature of the sign material (including language) its ability to represent and codify meaning and makes its own sign, denoting in its composition is not included but it is this indicating being. Understanding the sign as a fixative and transmitting social experience representing does not prevent the followers of two-way word concept, interpreted as sign language, still segmenting it on the labeling and labeling. As before in the course of a wide expressions like material covering the word,

its meaning, and others. Not quite agree with such statements hampered by the fact that the sign at all, sign language, in particular, is "a piece of matter," the so-called functional object being completely absorbed his material existence "[Ibid, p.100]. Segmentation of the word as a linguistic sign on labeling and denoted identically, in fact, the assertion that, as the sign itself as part of a functional material system semiotic nature is nothing else,

Axiomatic semiotics to the position of the one-sidedness of the mark is incompatible with the existing Indo-European linguistics in the tradition of the proclamation of the word duality unit. This contradiction some scientists are trying to remove audit behind the terms: the sign of all, sign language, in particular concepts. "Every sign, presents his point of view, for example, A. Kondrashov, a member of the signifier and the signified" [Kondrashov 1978, c.13]. Compromise understanding the sign language can be considered its definition by the relation linking the two structural elements: the meaning and denoted occurring, in particular, de Saussure in the later period of its scientific research [Saussure 2006, c.114].

Other linguists bring about changes in the interpretation of the iconic nature of both the language and the words of his units. "The language, of course, inherent in symbolic side, says LO Reznikov, and it is essential in the language ... But the language as a whole can not be regarded as a system of signs, as in the language and includes the values of linguistic units, is by no means marks [Reznikov 1967, c.109]. "Interesting" is also in this respect the interpretation of meaning of the word as it is "organic part" of the reason the word if can not only be a sign. "It (that is the word - Oh.), Writes R. Budin, able to perform some functions of the mark, but the word is not limited to the sign. Only in the case where the value is displayed outside the word, the word can be identified with a sign "[Budin 1967, c.120].

The absence of Indo-European linguistics unified theoretical framework on the nature of the word questions, fulfill their functions, etc. It causes word as a term. Inability to perform the functions of terminological word - its ambiguity - a natural reflection of the "vagueness" of concepts behind it. Differences and contradictions in the understanding of the status word by various scientists - linguists difficult and will inevitably impede the definition of both words and accurate description of this concept. "Methods ... research remarks in this regard, VV Vinogradov, different linguists are very heterogeneous" [Vinogradov 1947, p.3]. It is no accident that "linguists avoid to give definition of the word, readily limiting its task indicating only some (mainly phonetic) or internal (or grammatical) sign word "[Ibid, p.89]. Creating a natural way, terminological inflation and conceptual apparatus of Indo-European linguistics, "are the words of phonetic, grammatical words,

vocabulary words, etc." [Ibid, p.9]. Consequence of the above - just as amazing blackout seamntic structure of the word as a term, the total worth of which the concept begins thus divided into a plurality of corresponding empirical varieties.

One type of regular words in Indo-European linguistics is rather part of the opposition: the word as a unit of language and word as a unit of speech. Terminology "nest" the word is expanded by concepts such as: word form, word formation and inflection, respectively form word formation and inflection, and many others as well.

"Jack" units such as words: word formation, inflection, their forms, etc. in this paper it is not rational, not only because of its limited scope, but mainly because of the lack in the majority of modern linguists serious aspirations to unify the definition of the word, giving it the status is indeed the term. We recall only that the main manifestations of the concepts but terminological words still remain:

1) its terminological inflation caused by concepts behind the word, are displayed particularly vividly against the background of more or less the uniqueness of words in the language, that is, outside of the linguistic terminology. The absence of the word like the term well-defined seamntic structure deprives him of conceptual certainty serving hallmark of terminology as a whole;

2) Mismatch seamntic structure words, given its membership in the common language system, its use terminological;

3) Going beyond the terminological field one special sphere (linguistics), functioning under other terminology systems as well (the word in logic, mathematics, mathematical logic, semiotics).

Exhaustive and bearing the terminological definition of the word in Indo-European linguistics is still missing. With the same sounds as soon as the relevance of the statement of Ferdinand de Saussure that "so far in the field of language is always satisfied by operations on both units should not be defined" [Saussure 2006, p.133].

Traditionally, it is believed that a universal definition of the word difficult, if not completely eliminate the differences in the national languages.

Structural types of words, as the linguistic material, which is closely linked to the general typological characteristics of language and depends on it. Meanwhile, the "examination of systems are not even genetically related languages, it reveals not only the difference between them, but finds many similarities as" [Bedouin de Courtenay 1963, p.72]. It is applied to the word occurring in all the languages of the world: words like language and speech

units, a formal modification of words in verbal communication, non-identity of material embodiment and the structure of functioning in speech sounding and written words, the inability to highlight words simultaneously based on the criterion etc.

The undisputed fact of the existence of words in all the national languages is an objective basis for identifying the related word of the language phenomena and processes across both groups of related and non-related languages. For modern linguistics topical issue of identification of the universal features inherent in human language at all. One of its most urgent tasks - to develop apparatus that adequately describe the languages of different systems.

Integration at the present stage already learned material, the degree of completeness and the systematic source material makes it possible to find a universal criterion of selection of words in the national language, revealing universal parameters combining words into one functionally identical class. To unify the definition of the word to all the national languages of the problem is quite real also because "the diversity of the characteristics of individual languages can, however, did not prevent the definition of" word at all, "because in this variety are distinguished and similarities, emerges as the most significant features of the word, for all possible deviations from typical cases "[Reformed, 1967, p.56].

The problem of linguistic status word appears, needs some reformulation with the following main points:

I. The existence of words in all the languages does not allow to give them as a fact of linguistic reality. Not once occurred in Indo-European linguistics, the illusion of non-universal nature of words undermined general linguistic use of the word in the national languages in which it is understood primarily as a material, conventionally character unit, which serves to transmit a particular seamntic information.

II. The right of occurrences in the linguistic terminology is confirmed by the inability to avoid this concept when describing the actual language material.

III. Solution of the problem of "overcoming" despecialization word as a term is of particular relevance to the background of a more or less definite use in the language.

IV. Serious objections in connection with the problem of linguistic status of the word is the tendency of its undifferentiated scientific consideration as a unit of language and speech. Such a theoretical position is contrary coming from Ferdinand de Saussure and prepared the development of scien-

tific thought linguistic dichotomy "language, speech", delimiting such phe-nomena as a means of communication and its application.

V. The difference of language and speech is of fundamental importance for the differentiation of their units as well. Linguistic comparison of the concepts of language, and it does not give grounds to consider the word as a unit of language identical words like speech units. Language units are units of communication in their communicative readiness of speech in speech communication units in their communicative use.

VI. A description of any object (including language) involves determin-ing, , selection, produced on the basis of certain assumptions. The starting point for determining the status of the word in any language, but not the end result of his descriptions, should, in our view, be a solution to the question of the primacy of language or verbal aspects of speech.

VII. The objective existence of sounding speech and in writing, with each non-identical material embodiment and the structure cause differences in operating these words. Confidence in the correctness of the information about the word parallel analysis of speech sounding facts and writing put forward is supported by such scholars as, LV Secker and some others, un-fortunately, have not received an adequate response, the requirements of the ideal preparation grammars and dictionaries on the basis of what has been said and written.

VIII. Appeal to even the most superficial facts of all, including Indo-European, languages reveals, usually ambiguous correspondence between words as well) phonetic (in speech) and graphic (speech writing) substances, on the one hand and b) the substance of the seamntic on the other hand. Both in writing and in speech sounding word can represent from one to sev-eral units.

In a fundamentally different plane to be displayed to the traditional par-adigm of Indo-European linguistics of the question about the meaning of words is not possible to interpret it as a "special" nature of the linguistic sign a bilateral plan unit expression and content of the plan. Void, and the inter-pretation of the word only as units without regard to the form of its expres-sion.

IX. Relevance been a loss in Indo-European largest number of support-ers value thesis as his word "organic portion" demands in respect of another extension of the principle, based on which the words may be compiled into a single functionally identical class. "Words do not have values, they have the function». [Church, 1961, c.127].

X. Impossibility allocation words at the same time on the basis of the criterion makes linguistic termination "signified" the word apart from the form of its expression is objectively necessary in view of the deterministic real terms they asymmetry.

References:

1. Baudouin de Courtenay I.A. On the mixed nature of all languages. // Selected Works of general yazykoznaniyu.T.1.M. USSR Academy of Sciences, 1963, 362 p.

2. Burundi S.A. Category values in the general theory of linguistics. // Problems of Linguistics. New York, 1967. 1015 p.

3. Vinogradov V.V. Russian language (grammatical doctrine of the word). - M., 1947, 785 p.

4. Kondratev S. Sounds and signs. USA. Knowledge, 1978, 208 p.

5. Reznikov L.O. Neo-positivist epistemology and theory of sign language. // Problems of Philosophy. Moscow, 1967, II.110 p.

6. Reformed A.A. Introduction to Linguistics. – Paris, AspekPress, 1967. 536 p.

7. Solntsev V.M. Language as Systematic education. – M. Nauka, 1978. 345 p.

8. F. de Saussure. Course in General Linguistics. - Paris.: Kom, 2006. 278 p.

9. Church. J. Language and the Discovery of Reality. - New York, 1961, 245 p.